DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 444 JC 770 175

AUTHOR Hazard, Francis E.
TITLE Status Survey of Institutional Research--Ohio's Two-Year Campuses.
INSTITUTION Ohio Board of Regents, Columbus.
PUB DATE 11 Mar 77
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Educational Researchers; Inservice Education; *Institutional Research; *Junior Colleges; *Organization; Research Needs; Research Problems; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted in an effort to determine the state of development of institutional research in Ohio public two-year institutions. A questionnaire mailed to the chief administrative officer at each campus yielded a response rate of 84%. Results of the survey showed: (1) at least 84% of the two-year campuses have or may be served by an institutional research office; (2) 62% of the autonomous campuses had institutional research offices; (3) the educational backgrounds of those responsible for institutional research was generally strong, although most had only one to five years of research experience; (4) only six of the two-year campuses had a person responsible for institutional research on a full-time basis, while 32% of the campuses required less than 25% of a staff member's time in the research function; (5) approximately 300 studies were conducted annually at two-year campuses and respondents indicated significant interest for further studies related to curriculum, instruction, goals and objectives, public relations, and community studies; and (6) priorities for institutional research were identified as determination of future and immediate needs and identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses, but preparation of descriptive reports, while low in priority, was the second most time-consuming function. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135444

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATUS SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Prepared for: Dr. Max J. Lerner
Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Campuses
The Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio

Prepared by: Dr. Francis E. Hazard, Director
Kent State University
Tuscarawas Campus
New Philadelphia, Ohio

March 11, 1977

JC 770 175

"The key to effective administration is the ability of the president and those who work with him to ask the right questions and then to find the right answers. But the right answers to the right questions, whether they are specific in relation to a given institution or whether they are more comprehensive, must take into account all the relevant, factual data—the kind that only institutional research can provide."—A. J. Brumbaugh, Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning, *American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.* 1960.

STATUS SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Table of Contents

Summary.....iii

Preface..... vi

Introduction..... 1

Most of Ohio's Two-Year Campuses Are Served By
An Office of Institutional Research..... 6
Table 1: Public Two-Year Autonomous Institutions
of Ohio With Established Institutional
Research Offices..... 7

Staffing of Institutional Research Offices; Table II..... 8

Titles of Persons Responsible for Institutional
Research; Table III..... 9

Educational Background of the Person Responsible For
Institutional Research on Ohio's Two-Year Campuses;
Table IV..... 10

Immediate Supervisors of Persons Responsible for
Institutional Research on Ohio's Two-Year Campuses;
Table V..... 11

Percent of Time Devoted to Institutional Research;
Table VI..... 12

Institutional Research Studies Conducted on Ohio's
Two-Year Campuses..... 13
Table VII: Institutional Research Studies Conducted on Ohio's Two-Year Campuses
Within The Past Two Years and the
Number That Should Be Conducted..... 14

Ranking of Institutional Functions..... 15
Table VIII: Relative Amount of Time and Relative
Importance of Institutional Research
Functions on Ohio's Two Year Campuses... 16

Membership in Professional Research Organizations;
Table IX..... 17

Desired In-Service Research Training; Table X..... 18

Conclusion..... 19

Recommendations..... 20

Survey Instrument Used in Institutional Research Survey..... 21

Directory of Institutions Included in Institutional Research Survey..... 23

Map of Ohio Two-Year System..... 24

OHIO BOARD of REGENTS

30 East Broad Street, 36th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 466-6000

Dr. James A. (Dolph) Norton, Chancellor

Marvin L. Warner, Chairman
Robert F. Doolittle, Vice Chairman
Marjorie E. Fawcett, Secretary
Paul E. Belcher
James J. Flannery
Donald L. Huber
Mary Ellen Ludlum
William C. Safford
James W. Shocknessy
M. Morris Jackson, Ex-Officio
Marcus A. Roberto, Ex-Officio

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Two-Year College Presidents
University Branch Administrators

FROM: Dr. Max J. Lerner
Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Campuses

DATE: February 2, 1977

RE: Needed Information for the Research Conference

As I am sure you are aware that the Ohio Board of Regents is co-sponsoring a three day meeting on March 9, 10 and 11 in Columbus, Ohio, on Institutional Research in the Two-Year Colleges. I trust that representatives of your institution will be in attendance at this meeting.

To assist me in planning for this meeting, I have asked Dr. Francis Hazard to prepare the attached one page Questionnaire regarding the Extent of Institutional Research that is presently being conducted on the Two-Year Campuses.

This Bench Mark Study can be completed by you in just a few minutes. I very much appreciate you returning this to Dr. Hazard by February 18, 1977.

MJL:cae
Attachment

STATUS SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

SUMMARY

The purpose of this survey was an attempt to determine the present state of development of institutional research in the public two-year campus institutions of Ohio. The development of institutional research in the two-year campuses of Ohio is of vital concern to the Ohio Board of Regents and to the individual institutions.

The method used in this study was a survey instrument which was mailed to the chief administrative officer at each campus. Follow up telephone calls were utilized to obtain a response of 84% of Ohio's institutions which operate fifty-five campuses which have a two-year role and mission. Since this was an initial survey, only basic questions about the development of the institutional research function on each campus were explored.

The results of the survey showed that at least 84% of the two-year campuses have or may be served by an office of institutional research.

Fifteen (62%) of Ohio's autonomous two-year institutions had offices of institutional research while eight (33%) did not. All responding universities with responsibility for two-year campuses indicated having established a separate centralized office to coordinate institutional research for the two-year campuses under their jurisdiction. Yet three regional campuses indicated having established an office of institutional research.

Educational background of those responsible for institutional

research on Ohio's two-year campuses is generally strong, since most hold a Masters Degree or higher. However, their years of experience in research is relatively low since most have less than one to five years. At least half of the institutional research officers report to the Chief Executive Officer of their institution. Perhaps one of the best measures of committment to the institutional research function on Ohio's two-year campuses is indicated by the amount of time devoted to the function. Only six of the two-year campuses have a person responsible for institutional research on a full time basis, whereas, 32% spend less than 25% of the person's time to the institutional research function.

The survey indicated that an aggregate of approximately 300 studies are being conducted on Ohio's two-year campuses annually. Further, there was significant interest in the number of additional studies which respondents recommended should be done. There was interest for increased studies of curriculum, instruction, goals and objectives, public relations, and community studies. The extent of research being conducted suggests that a potential exists for the sharing of research findings. The amount of time and relative importance assigned to the various research functions helped to identify priorities of survey respondents. The top priority in consumption of time and importance was "the determination of immediate and future needs." On the other hand, the preparation of descriptive reports ranks number two in consumption of time; but ranked number five in relative importance. Similarly, the "identification of strengths and weaknesses of the

institution" holds high importance (number 2) yet receives less time (number 7).

Membership in one or more professional associations concerned with research is low compared to the number of two-year institutions in Ohio. Respondents expressed a desire for in-service training programs for institutional research staff on follow up studies, research design and methodology, sharing studies, characteristics and organizing an office of institutional research.

In conclusion this survey shows that there is much diversity in the status of institutional research among the two-year campuses of Ohio. A few institutions have well-established offices of institutional research with qualified professional staff and the necessary clerical help. However, little more than one-third have established offices of institutional research on individual two-year campuses and few have allocated resources to employ qualified professionals for the institutional research function as it applies to the research needs of the campus in the local community where it operates.

For the two-year campuses to reach their potential, it would appear that more attention, commitment, planning, developing, directing, and nurturing of persons who are interested in the advancement of institutional research in the two-year campuses should take place for the sake of improved management, planning, evaluation, and accountability in Ohio's two-year institutions.

PREFACE

This survey of the status of Institutional Research on the two-year campuses of Ohio was initiated during February, 1977. Impetus for the survey came from interest by the Ohio Board of Regents in encouraging institutional research in the two-year colleges. The survey was further stimulated and reported at a March 1977, institutional research conference for two-year campuses held in Columbus, Ohio. The conference was sponsored by The Ohio Board of Regents, Educational Testing Service, College Entrance Examination Board, The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and The American Educational Research Association, Special Interest Group for Community/Junior College Research, North Central Region.

It was assumed that the encouragement of institutional research would assist The Ohio Board of Regents in collection and use of data for its management information system and state-wide planning, and would also assist the respective campuses in their management, planning, evaluation, and accountability activities.

The need for educational and institutional research for two-year campuses becomes evident in times when roles change, public support and understanding becomes increasingly critical and institutional maturation is sought in an orderly and efficient manner. In preparing for the future, Ohio's two-year campuses must and will rely more upon institutional research to guide their development and vitality.

Although the functions of an institutional researcher are comprehensive, the primary function includes doing some of the types of

studies listed below. For the purposes of this study it is assumed that some of these studies and reports will be accomplished on every two-year campus even in the absence of a centralized office of institutional research or a person so titled.

1. Outcomes or Evaluation Studies: program or curriculum evaluation; student success, retention, academic achievement, student follow-up/placement studies; academic accrediation or multi-program mission achievement; teaching effectiveness; effectiveness of media, materials, or methods; other outcome or evaluation studies.

2. Descriptive Studies: HEGIS, Ohio Board of Regents and other externally required reports; student characteristics profiles; faculty characteristics; faculty load, student-teacher ratio; or class size reports; salary/fringe benefit studies, descriptions of applications; attrition, graduation, or the equivalent; information supporting the budgeting process; opinion samplings; other descriptive studies.

3. Planning Studies: enrollemnt projections; space utilization and/or needs; strategies to increase effectiveness of funds utilization; resource allocation or cost-effectiveness studies; devising simulation models of institutional dynamics; other planning or operational studies.

4. Policy Studies: institutional long range plans; analysis of economic and/or social considitions affecting the college; goal-setting; effects of proposed policy changes; other policy studies.

The intent of the survey was not to evaluate the institutional research function on the two-year campuses, but rather to set a bench mark study to determine the status of institutional research for Ohio's two-year campuses. Planning by The Ohio Board of Regents frequently requires collection of information and reports from the two-year campuses. Hence, it is essential that the institutional research capabilities of the two-year campuses be considered.

Response to the survey was excellent, and much interest was generated in the State of Ohio. Because of great diversity among the several types of campuses which offer two-year programs under a variety of organizational and governance arrangements, one must be cautious in interpreting results of the survey. It is hoped that this brief report will be useful to the two-year campuses of Ohio in assessing their institutional research efforts or in planning the establishment of an institutional research office. If this study succeeded in stimulating the reader's inquiry and concern about institutional research on and for Ohio's two-year campuses, its goal will have been largely satisfied.

Conclusions and observations drawn by the author do not necessarily represent those of The Ohio Board of Regents nor of individual institutions participating in the survey.

Prepared for: Dr. Max J. Lerner
Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Campuses
The Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, Ohio

Prepared by: Francis E. Hazard, Director
Kent State University
Tuscarawas Campus
New Philadelphia, Ohio

Acknowledgement: Appreciation is expressed to the Chancellor, and the Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Campuses, The Ohio Board of Regents, for encouragement and support of this study. The author is greatful for the assistance of Dr. Ivan J. Lach, Assistant Secretary for Research and Analysis, The Illinois Community College Board, in development of the survey instrument. Credit is also due those who responded to the survey.

INTRODUCTION

Historically, most two-year institutions have not included extensive statements about research in their role and mission documents because this function had been reserved largely for the major universities. In fact, this may be one of the reasons why two-year campuses have been relatively slow in establishing professional staff for the investigation of their problems by research methods. On the other hand, a strong case may be made for institutional research on the two-year campuses to the extent that it assists in management, planning, evaluation, and institutional operations.

Reporting requirements of outside agencies demand the collection of data from each campus. The fact that each campus is accredited separately imposes a requirement for self studies. Further, Ohio's two-year institutions are committed to local community service. This requires that local community-needs studies be conducted on a continuing basis. Finally, there is frequent interest on the part of faculty and administration on the individual two-year campuses to study needs, potentialities, and possibilities for improvement which can be aided by research in the development of improved management and instructional delivery systems and related support services.

The development of institutional research in behalf of the public two-year campuses of Ohio is of vital concern to the Ohio Board of Regents and others interested in the well-being of two-year college

programs in Ohio, and generally, those interested in the advancement of two-year college research. This initial survey was an attempt to determine the present status of institutional research on and for the public two-year campuses. Only basic questions about the institutional research function at each campus were explored.

In interpreting the data presented in this report, one must take into account several important characteristics about the mix of two-year colleges of Ohio. As they are organized today, the two-year campuses of Ohio are relatively new institutions being either reorganized or founded since the passing of several legislative acts in the early 1960's. The primary difference among institutions lies in their organizational governance. Ohio has five types of two-year campuses. Among the fifty-five public campuses with two-year missions in Ohio, 24 operate as autonomous institutions and 27 which are university affiliated. Among the autonomous institutions, there are five community colleges (one with three campuses) and 19 technical or general and technical colleges, one with two campuses. Eight universities operate a total of 23 two-year campuses that are classified as regional campuses, branches, technical or general and technical colleges. Additionally, the Universities of Akron, Cincinnati, Toledo, and Youngstown operate two-year urban community and technical colleges. Additionally, the University of Cincinnati designates a University College with a two-year role and mission.

Perhaps the greatest diversity among institutions relative to research activity, is the variance of size among the two-year institutions.

Head count enrollments range from a few hundred students in the rural areas of the state to a multi-campus community college in Cleveland with enrollment of nearly 28,000. Diversity also exists in the wealth of the regions sserved by the various two-year campuses. In several communities, one may find both a university regional campus, and a technical or a general and technical college located on the same campus, each with its own buildings and staff but serving a different role and mission. Altogether the above factors provide for a great deal of variety and contrast among the two-year campuses of Ohio. Thus, it may be concluded at the outset that organizational arrangements for the institutional research function on the two-year campuses will vary greatly.

There is some dilemma in speaking of Ohio's two year campuses whether it be in terms of those which are autonomous, one of which has three campuses (Cuyahoga Community College); when speaking of university affiliated campuses which are removed from the parent institution; or when speaking of two-year community and technical urban colleges located within a city university. For purposes of this paper, the terminology will generally be construed to mean two-year institutions, each of which operates in performance of a two-year role and mission within any one of several governance auspicies.

The method used in this study was a survey instrument which was mailed to the chief administrative officer at each two-year institution. Follow up telephone calls were utilized to obtain responses from a majority of the two-year institutions in Ohio. Responses were

received from all five community colleges, 18 of the 19 technical or general and technical colleges, 17 of the 23 university branch/regional campuses and two out of three university community and technical colleges. Responses were also received from eight out of ten universities which operate two-year campus programs. Thus, 42 of 50 (84%) two-year campus institutions responded to this survey.

As a matter of interest, a National survey of junior college institutional research, conducted by Swanson in 1964, found that fewer than 20 percent of the two-year colleges had formally organized programs of institutional research and fewer than one-third of the colleges surveyed had plans for evaluating their research programs. In 1968, another national survey was conducted for the same purpose under the auspices of the UCLA junior college leadership program. Findings of that study reported only 23 percent of the participating institutions had personnel employed to coordinate institutional research. In thirty-nine percent of the institutions no regular staff member had the responsibility for coordinating institutional studies. In other institutions, this responsibility was the task of an administrator. The study also revealed no relationship between the amount of institutional research and the institutional variables of age and/or type of control. The instutional variables of enrollment size, staff size, and budget correlated significantly with the number of studies reported by the institutions. *

---

*Roueche, John E; Boggs, John R. Junior College Institutional Research, The State of the Art. The American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington D. C., 1968.

A 1976 survey of 240 of the nation's two-year colleges reported at the Princeton Presidents Conference that 55% had an Institutional Research Office. This would indicate that the research office is an increasingly significant function among two-year institutions.

MOST OF OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES ARE SERVED BY AN OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Results of the survey show that at least 84% of the two-year campuses have or may be served by an office of institutional research. Below, on Table 1, a tabulation of the responses from the autonomous institutions indicates that 15 (62%) had offices of institutional research while eight (33%) did not.

Among the autonomous institutions which did not have established offices of institutional research compared to those which did have an established office, both groups contained large and small enrollments, and were both rural and urban areas.

While responses were received from 19 of 27 university related two-year campuses, only three indicated having established an office of institutional research of a regional campus. However, of the ten universities with two-year campus programs, all eight who responded to the survey indicated that the research function for their two-year campuses was served by the Research Office of the parent institution.

None of the universities indicated having established a separate centralized office of institutional research for the two-year campuses under their jurisdiction. None-the-less all indicated that much research is conducted by a variety of individuals and offices. The Kent State University Division of Regional Campuses employs a staff member whose title includes research responsibility for its regional campuses. Kent State Regional Campuses also employ an Associate Dean for Planning.

TABLE I

PUBLIC TWO-YEAR AUTONOMOUS INSTITUTIONS OF OHIO
WITH ESTABLISHED INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Have Established Institutional Research Office	15	62
Do Not Have Established Institutional Research Office	8	33
No Response	1	4

Total N = 24

STAFFING OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

An attempt to determine the extent of the commitment to institutional research in terms of personnel at the various two-year campuses of Ohio, revealed that only a few institutions committed more than one professional and one clerk or paraprofessional to the function of institutional research. In most cases, the institutional research function is being handled on a part-time basis using clerical help on a one-to-one ratio with professional staff assignment. Table II shows results to this particular item in the survey from 42 respondent two-year campuses.

TABLE II

STAFFING OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

	PROFESSIONAL	PARAPROFESSIONAL	CLERICAL
Autonomous Institutions			
Full Time			
More than 20 hours per week	8	4	4
Part Time			
20 hours or less per week	7	1	5
Separate University Related Campuses			
Full Time			
More than 20 hours per week	1		1
Part Time			
20 hours or less per week	2		2

TITLES OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

An analysis of the persons responsible for institutional research on Ohio's two-year campuses reveals that eight institutions had the title of Director of Institutional Research or similar which clearly indicated that most of the individuals' responsibilities were connected with institutional research. At seven other campuses, the person had a combined title which implied that his duties included institutional research in addition to another area of responsibility. Among the remaining institutions, the person responsible for the kinds of activities which are generally defined within the function of institutional research, had a title which implied another function such as Director, Assistant to the President, Dean of Instruction, etc.

TABLE III

TITLES OF PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE
FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Director of Institutional Research	8	16
Director of Institutional Research or Similar in Addition to Another Function	7	14
Title Which Does Not Imply Institutional Research	27	54
Unknown or No Response	8	16

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Table IV illustrates the academic preparation, area of specialization, and years of experience of the professional staff among the 18 two-year campuses with established offices of institutional research. It may be noted that one-half hold the terminal degree and the other half hold the Masters or more. It is significant that the experience level of those responsible for research on the two-year campuses is relatively low, a majority having experience five years or less. Table IV also indicates the background of 40 respondents to the survey.

TABLE IV

EUDCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES*

	18 Established Offices		Total All Two-Year Campuses	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Highest Degree:				
Ph. D.	9	50	13	26
Masters, Plus	9	50	25	50
Bachelor	0	0	2	4
No Response	0	0	10	20
Area of Specialization:				
Higher Education	6	33	6	12
Administration	3	17	4	8
Guidance	2	11	3	6
Other	7	38	15	30
No Response	0	0	12	24
Years of Experience:				
One to Five	13	72	9	18
Six to Ten	5	27	6	12
Ten to Fifteen	0	0	3	6
No Response	0	0	22	44

*Response Incomplete

IMMEDIATE SUPERVISORS OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

In Ohio's two-year institutions, a majority of respondents, 25, who are responsible for institutional research are under the immediate supervision of the President of the College, or the Chief Executive Officer. On twelve campuses, the institutional research person reported to other administrators. The Association for Institutional Research recommends that the institutional researcher should report to an administrator who has campus wide responsibilities. Practice on most Ohio's two-year campuses is consistent with this recommendation.

TABLE V

IMMEDIATE SUPERVISORS OF PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Immediate Supervisor	NUMBER	PERCENT
President or Chief Executive Office	25	50
Other Administrative Offices	12	24
No Response	13	26

PERCENT OF TIME DEVOTED TO INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

At six of the fifty two-year campuses in Ohio, the person responsible for institutional research devoted 75 to 100 percent of his time to that function. Only 20 percent of the responding institutions reported devoting more half of a person's time to the research function. On the other hand, 32 percent indicated spending less than 25% of the person's time to the institutional research function, even though these persons were designated as being responsible for that function. Table VI shows the tally of responses in terms of Ohio's fifty two-year campuses.

TABLE VI

PERCENT OF TIME THAT PERSON FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH DEVOTES TO THE FUNCTION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Percent of Time Devoted to Institutional Research	NUMBER	PERCENT
75 to 100%	6	12
50 to 75%	4	8
25 to 49%	8	16
0 to 24%	16	32
No Response	16	32

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH STUDIES CONDUCTED ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Table VII presents an aggregate of respondents estimates of research studies which have been conducted within the past two years together with opinions on the number which should be done. It may be observed that the extent of studies being conducted is both comprehensive, and significant in terms of volume. Although it is difficult to interpret the meaning of respondents suggestions for the number of studies which should be done, one might assume that there is a feeling of need for increased research in the areas of curriculum, instruction, goals and objectives, public relations, and community studies. Suggestions in addition to those listed on the survey instrument included: academic employment, co-op employment, information services, advising, student nurse selection, institutional characteristics, and relationships between branch campuses and parent institutions.

Although the issue of dissemination and implementation of the results of research studies was not explored in this study, there is great potential, if means can be developed to share the results of some 300 studies which institutions accomplish in Ohio on an annual basis. Several respondents indicated both the need for more research and for the sharing of research findings and routine reports among campuses. Sharing of findings would not only reduce duplication and overlap, but would also lead to improved quality of research.

TABLE VII

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH STUDIES CONDUCTED ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES WITHIN THE PAST TWO YEARS AND THE NUMBER THAT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED

	Number Done	Should Be Done
Admission, Registration & Enrollment	145	113
Students	95	55
Administration	38	33
Curriculum	36	72
Physical Plant	45	35
Finance	47	39
Instruction	34	60
Faculty	67	51
Goals and Objectives	36	49
Public Relations	20	33
Community	25	36
Other(Specify)	7	4
Total	595	580

RANKING OF INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS

Respondents were asked to indicate the relative amount of time spent by their college and the relative importance the respondent placed upon each function shown in Table VIII. Institutional research functions were then listed in priority order in accordance with those which required the most amount of time on the part of the institution conducting the research function.

For most functions, it may be seen that the respondents judgment about the relative importance of the function corresponds to the relative amount of time spent on the function. The "determination of immediate and future needs" is deemed most time consuming and also the most important. On the other hand, there are exceptions. While the preparation of descriptive reports ranks Number 2 in consumption of time, it holds lower rank (Number 5) in relative importance. Similarly, the "identification of strengths and weaknesses of the institution holds high importance (Number 2) yet receives less time (Number 7).

Several respondents indicated that so much time was required in the preparation of routine reports and compiling of data that less than a desired amount of time remained for research which was thought to be more important to the institution. This observation is corroborated in the ranking according to time spent on each function as indicated in the top four institutional research function activities.

TABLE VIII

RELATIVE AMOUNT OF TIME AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH FUNCTIONS ON OHIO'S TWO YEAR CAMPUSES

	Relative Amount of Time Spent on Function				Relative Importance of Function			
	Rank	Moderate	Little	No	Rank	Very	Somewhat	Not Very
The determination of immediate and future needs	1	25	10	0	1	32	5	0
The preparation of descriptive reports on institution status	2	23	11	1	5	21	12	5
Compiling data and other information which might be needed	3	22	13	0	4	25	10	2
Responding to state, federal, and other required reports	4	20	7	1	6	22	9	6
Master planning	5	18	14	3	3	25	11	1
The provision of assistance to any staff member, administrator in the planning, execution, and data analysis of studies conducted by them	6	16	13	7	7	19	13	3
The identification of strengths and weaknesses in the institution	7	15	17	4	2	26	10	0
Developing or assisting in the development of proposals and grant requests	8	11	15	10	8	15	15	4
The maintenance of an up-to-date research file of all studies conducted in the institution	9	9	14	13	9	14	15	3
The coordination of intra- and inter- institutional research	10	7	17	12	10	13	17	5
The periodic communication of briefs and summaries on research just completed or currently in progress	11	6	17	13	11	11	17	3
Others (please identify)	12		2		12	2		

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

Membership in one or more professional associations primarily concerned with research is indicated in Table IX. These memberships are generally held most frequently by respondents who indicated having established offices of institutional research on their campus. As Ohio's campuses increase activity and commitment to the research function in a more organized and coordinated fashion, it may be anticipated that those active in the research process will seek the benefits of membership in the professional organizations.

TABLE IX

MEMBERSHIP IN RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS BY PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Organization	Extent of Membership
Association for Institutional Research (AIR)	11
American Educational Research Association (AERA)	11
AERA North Central - Special Interest Group for Community/Junior College Research	12
Ohio Council for Inter-Institutional Research	12
Other	3

DESIRED IN-SERVICE RESEARCH TRAINING

Respondents expressed a desire for in-service training programs for institutional research staff covering several topics. These are listed in priority order in Table X. The highest priority concerned "methods of conducting follow up studies;" followed by "basic research design and methodology," and "sharing of two-year college research studies." These were followed by interest in "organizing an institutional research office" and "statistical methods." It would appear that opportunity exists for institutional research in-service training which might be accomplished by the professional organizations, the institutions of higher education, or by a consortia arrangement among the two-year campuses under leadership of The Ohio Board of Regents.

TABLE X

IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS DESIRED BY INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH STAFF ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Workshop on methods of conducting follow-up studies.	26
Workshop on basic research design and methodology.	23
Seminar for exchanging two-year college research studies.	15
Workshop on organizing an institutional research office.	23
Workshop on statistical methods.	17
Others: Modeling and Simulation - 1 Where to Get Help - 1	3

30

CONCLUSION

The results of this survey show that there is much diversity in the status of the institutional research function among the two-year campuses of Ohio. Several institutions have well established offices of institutional research with adequate professional staff and clerical help. The survey indicates that at least 84% of Ohio's two-year campuses are served by an office of institutional research. As many as 62% of the autonomous institutions indicated the presence of established offices of institutional research. Universities responsible for campuses with two-year missions indicated that the research function for those campuses and programs was served by the research office of the parent institution. However, none of the universities indicated having established a separate centralized office of institutional research for the two-year campuses under their jurisdiction. Three regional campuses indicated having established an office of institutional research.

Most of the institutions recognize the importance of the institutional research function and are engaged in research activities that play a vital role in the operation and administration of the two-year campuses. In addition, a high degree of interest was indicated by the respondents in research activities and functions which are typically performed by a two-year college office of institutional research. Several respondents from institutions without coordinated or centralized offices of research indicated a need for establishment of an office and greater

institutional research activity. Awareness of the need for institutional research is high, especially for local campus concerns. On the other hand, several of the smaller autonomous campuses indicated that a lack of resources prevented commitment to any significant amount of research activity. Similarly, several university affiliated campuses felt that an insufficient amount of attention and concern for local research needs was evident from the parent campus.

It appears that much potential exists for the expansion of the institutional research function in Ohio's two-year institutions. For those vitally interested in institutional research, a concern for improved quality is equally important to expanded quantity. It also appears that the universities are challenged to address the research needs of their individual two-year campuses. It is also apparent that The Ohio Board of Regents could render additional service to the individual institutions by increasing its feedback of studies and data collected from the respective institutions. Perhaps a future survey can better identify both the quantitative extent of research on Ohio's two-year campuses and also examine the quality of institutional research in Ohio's two-year campuses. Most importantly, encouragement, leadership and commitment must be provided to assure that two-year campus needs for localized institutional research are served.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) Ohio's two-year institutions should increase operational and philosophical commitments to the research function.

(2) The Ohio Board of Regents should continue its leadership in fostering and encouraging two-year college institutional research.

(3) Where no organized research office nor an individual designated to coordinate the research function exists, two-year campuses should assign an individual to coordinate institutional research studies, data collection and reports. Smaller campuses could begin by assigning an individual on a part-time basis.

(4) Increased institutional research activity should be developed at most of Ohio's two-year campuses to address individual campus needs regardless of institutional size, organization, or governance.

(5) Where research resources are insufficient for a small campus to accomplish quality research, arrangements and mechanisms should be developed to conduct studies critical to institutional operations, management, and evaluation. Examples are: student placement and follow up, program evaluation, institutional goals inventory, enrollment projections, community needs, etc.

(6) In-service training programs for researchers should be developed under any of several auspices: The Ohio Board of Regents; the state, regional, and national professional research organizations; the universities; and outside consultants.

(7) A state professional organization for two-year college research should provide for comprehensive membership of all who are interested in, and would benefit by, sharing in research of interest to the two-year institutions.

(8) Consumers and producers of research pertinent to two-year campuses should utilize the training, literature and contacts available in the professional research organizations.

A SURVEY OF THE CURRENT STATUS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ON OHIO'S TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

Due in Mail: February 18, 1977

Campus _____ **Date** _____

Name of Respondent _____

Title of Respondent _____

See instructions on the back of this instrument

A. Has your institution established an office for the Institutional Research function?
Yes. . . . . ( ) Year
No . . . . . ( ) Established. . ( )

B. Is your research office singularly responsible for multi-campus research activities?
Yes. . . . . ( ) No . . . . . ( )
(If yes indicate number _____ ; and names of each campus _____)

C. Please indicate how many staff of each type are employed in your Institutional Research Office?

	Professional	Paraprofessional	Clerical
Full-time (more than 20 hrs./week)	( )	( )	( )
Part-time (20 hrs. or less per week)	( )	( )	( )

D. What is the name and title of the person primarily responsible for Institutional Research?
Name _____
Title _____

E. Specify the educational background of the person responsible for institutional research.
1. Highest degree _____
2. Area of specialization _____
3. Years of experience in IR _____

F. Whom does the person responsible for Institutional Research report to?
1. President/Director/Campus Dean . . . . . ( )
2. Vice President/Assoc. Director. . . . . ( )
3. Dean of Instruction . . . . . ( )
4. Assistant to the President . . . . . ( )
5. Dean of Business. . . . . ( )
6. Dean of Student Services . . . . . ( )
7. Other (please specify). . . . . ( )

G. What percentage of time does the person responsible for institutional research devote to the Institutional Research function?
1. 75 to 100% . . . . . ( )
2. 50 - 75% . . . . . ( )
3. 25 - 49% . . . . . ( )
4. 0 - 24% . . . . . ( )

H. How many Institutional Research studies have been conducted at your campus in each of the areas below within the past 2 years and how many should be conducted?

		Number Done	Should Be Done
1.	Admission, Registration & Enrollment.	( )	( )
2.	Students	( )	( )
3.	Administration	( )	( )
4.	Curriculum.	( )	( )
5.	Physical Plant.	( )	( )
6.	Finance	( )	( )
7.	Instruction.	( )	( )
8.	Faculty	( )	( )
9.	Goals and Objectives	( )	( )
10.	Public Relations	( )	( )
11.	Community	( )	( )
12.	Other (Specify).	( )	( )

I. For each of the functions of Institutional Research listed below, indicate the relative amount of time spent by your college and the relative importance you place on the function.

IR Function	Relative Amount of Time Spent on Function: Moderate	Little	No	Relative Importance of Function: Very	Somewhat	Not Very
1. The preparation of descriptive reports on institution status	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. The identification of strengths and weaknesses in the institution.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. The determination of immediate and future needs	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Compiling data and other information which might be needed	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. The coordination of intra- and inter-institutional research	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Master planning	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. The provision of assistance to any staff member, administrator in the planning, execution, and data analysis of studies conducted by them.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. The maintenance of an up-to-date research file of all studies conducted in the institution.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. The periodic communication of briefs and summaries on research just completed or currently in progress.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Developing or assisting in the development of proposals and grant requests.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Responding to state, federal, and other required reports.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Others (please identify)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

J. Which of the following research organizations do persons responsible for Institutional Research belong to and how beneficial is each organization?

Organization	Member: Yes	No	Relative Value: Very Beneficial	Not Very Beneficial
1. Association for Institutional Research (AIR)	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. American Educational Research Association (AERA)	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. AERA North Central - Special Interest Group for Community/Junior College Research	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Ohio Council for Inter-Institutional Research	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Other (Specify)	( )	( )	( )	( )

K. Indicate which of the following type of inservice training programs your institutional research staff would like to participate in.
1. Workshop on methods of conducting follow-up studies ( )
2. Workshop on basic research design and methodology ( )
3. Workshop on statistical methods ( )
4. Seminar for exchanging two-year college research studies ( )
5. Workshop on organizing an institutional research office ( )
6. Others (Specify) ( )

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey should be completed by the person responsible for the institutional research function at your college. If you do not have an institutional research position, please forward this survey to your MIS coordinator or person most closely performing the institutional research function on your campus. Although the functions of an institutional researcher are comprehensive, his primary function includes doing some of the following types of studies:

1. Outcomes or Evaluation Studies: program or curriculum evaluation; student success, retention, academic achievement, student follow-up/placement studies; academic accreditation or multi-program mission achievement; teaching effectiveness; effectiveness of media, materials, or methods; other outcome or evaluation studies.

2. Descriptive Studies: HEGIS, Ohio Board of Regents and other externally required reports; student characteristics profiles; faculty characteristics; faculty load, student-teacher ratio; or class size reports; salary/fringe benefit studies, descriptions of applications; attrition, graduation, or the equivalent; information supporting the budgeting process; opinion samplings; other descriptive studies.

3. Planning Studies: enrollment projections; space utilization and/or needs; strategies to increase effectiveness of funds utilization; resource allocation or cost-effectiveness studies; devising simulation models of institutional dynamics; other planning or operational studies.

4. Policy Studies: institutional long range plans; analysis of economic and/or social considitons affecting the college; goal-setting; effects of proposed policy changes; other policy studies.

This survey is not an evaluation of the institutional research function on the two-year campuses. Instead, it is a bench mark study to determine the present status of institutional research in Ohio. The Ohio Board of Regents is interested in promoting institutional research in the two-year campuses and needs this basic information for that purpose. Survey findings will be generalized so that responses from no individual institution will be identified. Hence, we hope that you will give this survey your immediate attention. Your time and effort are greatly appreciated.

COMMENTS:

Mail To: Dr. Francis E. Hazard, Director
Tuscarawas Campus
Kent State University
University Drive N.E.
New Philadelphia, Ohio 44663

THE OHIO TWO-YEAR CAMPUSES

All institutions below, except those with asterisk, responded to the survey.

Two-Year Campuses

1. Agricultural Technical Institute Ohio State University
2. Ashtabula Branch, Kent State University
* 3. Belmont Branch, Ohio University
4. Belmont Technical College
* 5. Central Ohio Technical College
* 6. Chillicothe Branch, Ohio University
7. Cincinnati Technical College
8. Clark Technical College
9. Clermont Branch, University of Cincinnati
10. Columbus Technical Institute
11. Community and Technical College University of Akron
12. Community and Technical College University of Toledo
13. Cuyahoga Community College Metropolitan Campus
14. Cuyahoga Community College Eastern Campus
15. Cuyahoga Community College Western Campus
*16. East Liverpool Branch, Kent State University
17. Edison State General and Technical College
*18. Firelands Branch, Bowling Green State University
19. Geauga Branch, Kent State University
20. Hamilton Branch, Miami University
21. Hocking Technical College
22. Jefferson County Technical Institute
23. Lakeland Community College
24. Lancaster Branch, Ohio University
* 25. Lima Branch, Ohio State University
26. Lima Technical College
27. Lorain County Community College
28. Mansfield Branch, Ohio State University
* 29. Marion Branch, Ohio State University
30. Marion Technical College
31. Middletown Branch, Miami University
32. Muskingum Area Technical College
* 33. Newark Branch, Ohio State University
34. North Central Technical College
35. Northwest Technical College
36. Ohio College of Applied Science of the University of Cincinnati
37. The Michael J. Owens Technical College
38. Rio Grande Community College
39. Salem Branch, Kent State University
40. Shawnee State General and Technical College
41. Sinclair Community College
42. Southern State General and Technical College, South Campus
43. Southern State General and Technical College, North Campus
44. Stark Branch, Kent State University
45. Stark Technical College
* 46. College of Applied Science and Technology, Youngstown State University
47. Terra Technical College
48. Trumbull Branch, Kent State University
49. Tuscarawas Branch, Kent State University
* 50. University College, University of Cincinnati
51. Raymond Walters Branch, University of Cincinnati
52. Washington Technical College
53. Wayne Branch, University of Akron
54. Western Ohio Branch, Wright State University
55. Zanesville Branch, Ohio University

OHIO

The Two-Year System

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
APR 22 1977
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES